



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL  
OF  
SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES  
(CONTINUING HEBRAICA)

VOLUME XXIX

JULY, 1913

NUMBER 4

THE MODE OF EXPRESSING THE HEBREW 'Ā'ID IN  
THE GREEK HEXATEUCH

BY MAX L. MARGOLIS  
Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

1. It is the merit of Adolf Deissmann and his school<sup>1</sup> to have dispelled the notion that the Greek of the Septuagint was a jargon peculiar to the Alexandrian ghetto. Grammar (morphology) and vocabulary are to all intents and purposes the same in the Greek Bible as in the contemporary profane literature. Hebraisms (or Aramaisms) may be looked for at the most in the syntax, but even there their number is being constantly reduced as the papyri finds grow more numerous, and the balance have their origin in the growing tendency toward literalness which culminated in Aquila's mannerism of "rendering not words but syllables" with its adjustment to Akiba's hermeneutics. The opprobrious appellation "Jewish Greek" has made way for the more decorous epithet "translation Greek," the character of which largely depends upon a translator's individual bent of mind.<sup>2</sup>

2. One of the last landmarks to disappear was the construction in which a relative pronoun or adverb is resumed by a demonstrative pronoun or adverb: *οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ* = *whom*, *οὗ . . . ἐκεῖ* = *where*. In Arabic grammar the retrospective pronoun is known as the 'ā'id (الْعَائِدُ)<sup>3</sup>, which term, for the sake of brevity, is employed in this paper. Discounting a stray example in Herodotus<sup>4</sup> which is

not strictly analogous, instances have been quoted both from literature<sup>5</sup> and from letters<sup>6</sup> pointing to the spontaneous development of the idiom in the popular speech. Professor Moulton<sup>7</sup> has called the attention of students to Mrs. Gamp's colloquialism "which her name is Mrs. Harris" for which he adduces parallels from Chaucer and also from Old English where "this was the regular construction."

3. I have made a study of the manner in which the Hebrew 'ā'id is dealt with in the Hexateuchal group. My results go to show in the first place that in the estimation of Origen, at any rate, the expression of the 'ā'id meant a squaring with the "Hebrew truth": witness the introduction of the 'ā'id sub asterisco in his recension in cases where the Greek text which served as its basis omitted it. To cite an example: Deut. 28:48 אשר ישלחנו was rendered in good classical fashion οὐς επαποστελει; Origen, however, added sub ast. αυτοὺς.<sup>8</sup> If occasion demanded, Origen did not scruple to change the construction so as to bring in the 'ā'id alongside with any other element of the Hebrew lost in the freer translation of the Septuagint. Thus, e.g., he re-wrote Exod. 35:23, παρ ὧ εὐρεθη<sup>9</sup> to read πας ∓ ανηρ ὧ εὐρεθη παρ αυτω<sup>10</sup> = כל איש א' חור נמצא אחר. Sometimes he found the 'ā'id expressed, but it did not seem to him an adequate rendering of the Hebrew; so he changed it accordingly. Cf. Josh. 3:4 תלכו בה' ην πορευ(σ)εσθε αυτην BrzAΘb<sup>11</sup> <rell<sup>sii</sup>>, but ην . . . εν αυτη ufih <N. 56. 58; 63; 85<sup>m</sup>>.<sup>12</sup> Hence Origen distinguished one mode of expressing the 'ā'id from the other: the one was Hellenistic Greek, the other Hebraic Greek. Interesting is Origen's procedure in clauses with the relative pronoun as subject. Here it is permissible in Hebrew itself to omit the 'ā'id.<sup>13</sup> Where, however, it is expressed,<sup>14</sup> the Greek copula no more represents it than the English.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, where the copula was wanting in the Greek, Origen supplied it sub asterisco.<sup>16</sup> How mechanical his procedure was may be judged from an instance like Lev. 11:39 where the pronouns are both in the accusative dependent on εστιν (in the sense of εξεστιν cf. α) φαγειν = it is lawful to eat; Origen, however, from the point of view of bald literalism, took the relative pronoun to stand in the nominative and εστιν to correspond to והיא; naturally he found no place for αυτο, which he therefore ruled out by means of the obelus.

4. The obvious source of Origen's plus is as on so many other points Aquila or Theodotion.<sup>17</sup> Symmachus appears to have been sparing with the introduction of an unnecessary pleonasm,<sup>18</sup> just as the other two in conformity with their propensity to literalness in all the examples that have come under my observation are scrupulous in expressing the 'ā'id in all its forms.<sup>19</sup>

5. *Note:* Just as certain recensions or MSS indulge in supplementing the 'ā'id where the original translator left it unexpressed, so, conversely, an original pleonasm is wiped out in other witnesses of the text. Notable among them is *m* in the Pentateuch with 30 examples.<sup>20</sup> Of the versions based on the Greek the Syrohexaplar and the Old Latin have been collated by me afresh. The former has been found to be an exact reproduction of its archetype and therefore of great importance in ascertaining Origen's procedure in the point in question.<sup>21</sup> The case is different with the Latin. In the light of the 53 examples in which the pleonasm is obliterated<sup>22</sup> the inference would seem to be justified that the omission was a tribute paid to the genius of the Latin tongue. Such is the view of Ranke.<sup>23</sup> But the matter is not so simple. For, especially with a view to the other examples where the pleonasm is expressed, it is conceivable that the Greek archetype itself here and there removed the cumbrous pleonasm. The proper method is obviously to ascertain on other grounds the filiation of that archetype; if it can be shown that in the matter of the omission of the 'ā'id it goes with its group, well and good; if not, then only may the obliteration be laid at the door of the Latin translators. My conclusions for the Book of Joshua are given below.<sup>24</sup> I have likewise tabulated the Philonian evidence and find myself in accord with Ryle's observation<sup>25</sup> that Philo obliterated many a pleonasm which he found in the text of the Septuagint apparently because he regarded it as a vulgarism or Hebraism of which the Greek diction should be freed.<sup>26</sup> At all events, the evidence of Philo, the Latin, and such witnesses should be ruled out of court if we are to ascertain what the treatment of the 'ā'id was in the original Septuagint.

6. As for the original translator(s), elimination must be made of those instances in which in consequence of the adoption of a paraphrastic rendering more or less remote from the Hebrew the

construction is changed, no matter whether the relative clause is kept or whether it is replaced by a participial construction. Cf. an extreme example, Exod. 36:2, **א' נשאו לבר**, *whose heart impelled him*, *τους εκουσιως βουλομενους*, *those who were freely willing*; but also examples like **א' לו**, *ος εχει*, or *εχων*,<sup>27</sup> **א' בו**, *ος εχει εν (ε)αυτω*,<sup>28</sup> *that hath in him(self)*, or Exod. 25:2, **א' ידבנו לבר**, *whose heart maketh him willing*, *ους αν δοξη τη καρδια*, *to whom it seemeth good in their heart*, are instances to the point.<sup>29</sup> The Hebrew idiom **אח ידו מלא**<sup>30</sup> which is paraphrased in E.V. as "he was consecrated" is rendered literally by *ε* only in Exod. 28:37 (41) where it occurs for the first time:<sup>31</sup> *ενεπλησεν τας χειρας αυτου*; elsewhere in the Pentateuch the verb *τελειουν*, "make perfect,"<sup>32</sup> is employed, but the object is retained; but in Lev. 21:10 it is dispensed with: **א' . . . ומלא אח ידו . . . , και τετελειωμενον**. Both Origen<sup>33</sup> and Lucian,<sup>34</sup> it is true, supplied the object; but the construction remained unchanged, the accusative being one of specification.<sup>35</sup>

A peculiar construction meets us in Lev. 27:9, **א' יקריבו מינה**, *whereof men bring an offering*, *των προσφερομενων απ αυτων δωρον*=*αφ ων προσφερεται (απ αυτων) δωρον*,<sup>36</sup> that is to say, the verb which goes with the subject of the relative clause as its predicate is in the participial form made by attraction to agree with the antecedent. Of a Hellenistic character is the resumptive demonstrative in the paraphrase Exod. 35:21, **א' נשאו לבר**, *whose heart impelled him*, *ων εφερεν αυτων η καρδια*,<sup>36a</sup> *whose heart inclined*<sup>36b</sup> and 29, **א' נדב לבם אחם**, *whom their heart made willing* (or *whose heart made them willing*), *ων εφερεν η διανοια αυτων*.<sup>36c</sup> Similarly Num. 19:15, **א' אין צמיד פתיל עליו**, *οσα ουχι δεσμον καταδεδεται επ αυτω*.<sup>36d</sup> There are, however, examples where on the top of the paraphrase which really makes the complement altogether unnecessary the 'ā'id with its governing preposition is introduced, unmistakably betraying the influence of the Hebrew. Thus we read Gen. 24:40; 48:15, **א' הההלכתי (הההלכו) לפניו . . .**, E.V., *before whom . . . did walk*, *ω ευηρεσθησα(ν)*<sup>37</sup> . . . *ευαντιον* (s. *ευωπιον*) *αυτου*,<sup>38</sup> *to whom . . . was (were) pleasing in his sight*.<sup>38a</sup>

7. Sometimes the pleonasm is removed by a device which consists either in deflecting the regimen of the verb to the relative

pronoun or in replacing the Hebrew relative by a conjunction. E.g. Gen. 24:37, 'אֲנֹכִי יֹשֵׁב בְּאֶרֶץ, E.V., *in whose land I dwell*, might have been rendered *ὡν ἐγὼ παροικῶ ἐν τῇ γῇ (αὐτῶν)*; but the translator chose to write *ἐν οἷς* (s. *μεθ' ὧν*) *ἐγὼ (παρ)οικῶ ἐν τῇ γῇ αὐτῶν, among whom I sojourn in their land*, as if=*בְּאֶרֶץ יֹשֵׁב בּוֹ*.<sup>39</sup> This mode is particularly resorted to when the 'ā'id is dependent upon the infinitival complement to the verb of the relative clause: Exod. 6:8, 'אֲנִי נִשְׂאֲתִי אֶת יָדִי לָתֵת אֹהֶה, prop. *which I lifted up mine hand to give*,<sup>40</sup> *εἰς ἣν*<sup>41</sup> *ἐξείτευνα τὴν χεῖρα μου δοῦναι αὐτῇ*=*super quam levavi manum meam ut darem eam* Ὡ as if=*אֲנִי נִשְׂאֲתִי אֶת יָדִי עָלֶיהָ לָתֵת אֹהֶה*.<sup>41a</sup> Examples of conjunctive construction: Lev. 15:18, 'אֲנִי יֹשֵׁב . . . אֹהֶה, *εἰν*<sup>42</sup> *κοιμηθῇ . . . μετ' αὐτῆς*; Deut. 31:4, 'אֲנִי הַשְׁמִיד אֹתָם, *καθὼτι ἐξώλεθρευσεν αὐτούς*; Josh. 22:17, 'אֲנִי לֹא הִטְהַרְנּוּ מִמֶּנּוּ, *ὅτι*<sup>43</sup> *οὐκ ἐκαθαρίσθημεν* (s. *κεκαθαρίσμεθα*) *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*.<sup>44</sup> In all such examples no element of the Hebrew is suffered to be lost, but the Greek construction which ensues assumes in no way a barbarous form.

8. While as a rule Hebrew and Greek, and for that matter also Hebrew and English, verbs have the same government, instances must obviously arise in which the government exercised by a verb will differ in the different languages. To take one example, Greek *ἐκλεγῆσθαι* and English "choose" are followed by the accusative, whereas Hebrew *בָּחַר* is construed with the preposition *ב*. In Num. 16:5 we have the classical construction, *οὓς ἐξελέξατο* for *בּוֹ אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר בּוֹ*,<sup>45</sup> but in 17:5 (20) we read *ὅν εἰν ἐκλεξώμαι αὐτόν* for *בּוֹ אֲבָחַר בּוֹ*.<sup>46</sup> So far the translator still remains on Greek ground, albeit the diction has been accommodated to Hellenistic models. But when Deut. 22:12, 'אֲנִי תִכְסֶה בָּהּ, is rendered *α (ε) ἀν περιβαλῇ ἐν αὐτοῖς*, we have an unmistakable instance of Hebrew influence for which Hellenistic Greek will scarcely show a model.<sup>47</sup> What the recensions were capable of doing in cases just like these we have seen above.<sup>48</sup> But even the original translators were not deterred from going to this length of imitating the Hebrew.

9. So long as the laws of concord between the relative and the 'ā'id are observed, the Hebraic character of the Greek construction is obscured and to that extent the idiom may be pronounced of Hellenistic *provenance*. This is especially true when the concord is

absolute; that is to say when the relative and demonstrative are in the same case: אֹחִי . . . 'אֵן . . . αὐτον;<sup>49</sup> cf. classical οὐ;<sup>50</sup> וְ . . . . . 'אֵן οὐ(τινος) . . . αὐτου;<sup>51</sup> cf. οὐ, τινος;<sup>52</sup> לוֹ . . . 'אֵן ω (s. τινι) . . . αὐτω;<sup>53</sup> (οὐ)τινος (. . .) αὐτου;<sup>54</sup> cf. ω<sup>55</sup> (also for אֲלִיךָ . . . 'אֵן<sup>56</sup>), οὐ, (οὐ)τινος;<sup>57</sup> כִּמְדוֹר . . . 'אֵן הִתִּישׁ תּוֹיֹאֲתָהּ;<sup>58</sup> or, in prepositional phrases, where both are preceded by the same preposition governing the same case: (בְּקִרְבוֹ, בְּחֻכּוֹ) בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן ἐν ω . . . ἐν αὐτω;<sup>59</sup> cf. ἐν ω;<sup>60</sup> ἐφ' ω . . . ἐπ' αὐτω;<sup>61</sup> cf. ἐφ' ω;<sup>62</sup> ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>63</sup> cf. ἐφ' οὐ;<sup>64</sup> εἰς οὐ . . . εἰς αὐτου;<sup>65</sup> cf. εἰς οὐ;<sup>66</sup> δι' οὐ . . . δι' αὐτου;<sup>67</sup> מִבִּמְנִי . . . 'אֵן ἀφ' οὐ . . . ἀπ' αὐτου;<sup>68</sup> עֲלִיךָ . . . 'אֵן ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>69</sup> cf. ἐφ' οὐ;<sup>70</sup> ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>71</sup> cf. ἐφ' οὐ;<sup>72</sup> εἰς οὐ . . . εἰς αὐτου;<sup>73</sup> or, with adverbs, when classical οὐ (οπου)<sup>74</sup> becomes οὐ (οπου) . . . ἐκεῖ<sup>75</sup> = שָׁם . . . 'אֵן (שְׁמִיָּה) and \*οθεν—οθεν . . . ἐκεῖθεν<sup>76</sup> = מִשָּׁם . . . 'אֵן. It is immaterial in this respect, nay, it is a sign of elasticity, when בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן and שָׁם . . . 'אֵן are, as it sometimes happens, interchanged, so long as complete concord is observed: בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן οὐ . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>77</sup> cf. οὐ;<sup>78</sup> שָׁם . . . 'אֵן ἐν ω . . . ἐν αὐτω.<sup>79</sup> The case is somewhat different when the concord is less exact; that is when, in prepositional phrases, the prepositions in front of the relative and the demonstrative, though the same, govern different cases: בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>79a</sup> עֲלִיךָ . . . 'אֵן ἐφ' ω . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>80</sup> cf. ἐφ' ω;<sup>81</sup> ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>82</sup> or, as the case may be, are themselves different: בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן ἐν ω . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>83</sup> ἐν ω . . . ἐπ' αὐτω;<sup>84</sup> εἰς οὐ . . . ἐν αὐτω;<sup>85</sup> εἰς οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>86</sup> δι' οὐ . . . ἐν αὐτω;<sup>87</sup> ἐξ' οὐ . . . ἐν αὐτω;<sup>88</sup> καθ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>89</sup> μεθ' οὐ . . . ἐν αὐτω;<sup>90</sup> עֲלִיךָ . . . 'אֵן εἰς οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>91</sup> περὶ οὐ . . . κατ' αὐτου;<sup>92</sup> and, with adverbs, when either the relative or demonstrative adverb makes way for a prepositional phrase (preposition with pronoun): שָׁם . . . 'אֵן ἐν ω . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>93</sup> εἰς οὐ . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>94</sup> שְׁמִיָּה . . . 'אֵן εἰς οὐ . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>95</sup> ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>96</sup> ἐν ω . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>97</sup> מִשָּׁם . . . 'אֵן ἐξ' οὐ . . . ἐκεῖθεν;<sup>98</sup> cf. ἐξ' οὐ;<sup>99</sup> so also בְּרִי . . . 'אֵן οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου;<sup>100</sup> עֲלִיךָ . . . 'אֵן ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐκεῖ;<sup>101</sup> οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτω;<sup>102</sup> οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτου.<sup>103</sup> The desire for variation is undoubtedly at the root of all such constructions and on the whole there is nothing to be said against their Hellenistic character; but when, as we may observe in some of the types enumerated,<sup>104</sup> the form which the complement in prepositional phrases assumes follows the Hebrew in a literal manner, the conclusion forces itself upon us that we are dealing with a construction tinged

with a Hebraic color. A still clearer trace of Hebrew influence may be discerned in those examples where the relative pronoun is taken out of the regimen of the relative clause and is placed in a hanging case assimilated to that of the antecedent beyond the models permissible in classical Greek. Cf. e.g. Num. 3:31 **וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁרָתוּ בָהֶם** *και τα σκευη . . . οσα λειτουργουσιν εν αυτοις*, lit. *and the vessels . . . which they minister with them*.<sup>105</sup> This, of course, would be English in Mrs. Gamp's language; and while it may be said that the construction grew up spontaneously in Hellenistic Greek thus witnessing to the gradual atrophy of the Greek relative pronoun which led to the substitution for it in modern Greek of a relative linkword (adverb),<sup>106</sup> it is more probable to assume that the translator is imitating the Hebrew **אֲשֶׁר** in its indeclinableness.<sup>107</sup>

10. The proportion of Hellenistic-Hebraic construction in which the Hebrew 'ā'id is expressed in one or the other of the modes illustrated above to the classical constructions in which the 'ā'id is ignored is in the several books of the Hexateuch as far as we can get at the original text of the translators as follows:<sup>108</sup>

	Hellenistic-Hebraic Construction	Classical Construction
Genesis . . . . .	19	20
Exodus . . . . .	24	12
Leviticus . . . . .	35	17
Numbers . . . . .	32	8
Deuteronomy . . . . .	49	13
Joshua . . . . .	12	9

Hence the books of the Hexateuch with regard to the expression of the 'ā'id range themselves as follows: Genesis (almost 1:1); Joshua (4:3); Exodus and Leviticus (2:1), Numbers and Deuteronomy (4:1). The Hellenistic-Hebraic construction is clearly on the ascendant in the line

—Genesis, Joshua, Exodus—Leviticus, Numbers—Deuteronomy +.

#### NOTES

(1) Adolf Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, 1895; *Neue Bibelstudien*, 1897; *Die sprachliche Erforschung der griechischen Bibel*, 1898; "Hellenistisches Griechisch" in *PRE*,<sup>3</sup> 1899; "Die Hellenisierung des semitischen Monotheismus" in *Neue Jahrbücher f. d. klassische Altertum*, 1903, 161 ff.; James Hope Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, I (Prolegomena),<sup>2</sup> 1906,



(8) So G=absque notis coptx. Similarly Exod. 36:5 אַחֶה . . . א' (the 'ā'id dependent upon an infin.; see note 41a) οσα (s.a.) . . . ✕ αυτα IŠ = ckm absque notis. Exod. 35:29 in שְׁלֹמֹה יָרַד מִן הַכֵּס וְיָצָא מִן הַכֵּס (שְׁלֹמֹה יָרַד מִן הַכֵּס) would be a further instance for the accusative; but the reading is not extant in Greek (for the rendering of the Septuagint see § 6). An example of the 'ā'id in the genitive is Deut. 29:18 (17), τινος η διανοια ✕ αυτου: G=absque notis coptx. More numerous are the examples with prepositions: Exod. 3:5, εν ω συ εστηκας ✕ επ αυτου IŠ (with express mention of α') = absque notis ckx (cf. επ αυτον F<sup>b m</sup>); 34:10, εν οις ει συ ✕ εν μεσω αυτου IŠ = absque notis cm; Deut. 8:9, επα της . . . φαγγης ✕ εν αυτη: G=absque notis cx; 11:24, ου εαν πατηγη . . . ✕ εν αυτω: G=absque notis cox; Josh. 1:3, ου εαν επιβητε . . . ✕ επ αυτου (so r; o rds. επ αυτω; θ' wrote επ αυτον) IŠ = absque notis ro (cf. εφ ου . . . επ αυτον UF; for the sigla which I use in Josh. see AJSL, XXVIII (1911), 4); 9, 4 (8, 31), ου εαν περιβληθη ✕ επ αυτοις IŠ = absque notis Furh (post σιδηρος) b (=Lagarde) ⟨58; 15. 18. 64. 128; 209; 63; 85<sup>m</sup>⟩; 14:9, εν τη ρομφαια ✕ εν αυτη: GS = absque notis b (cf. «επ αυτη 58»). The 'ā'id an adverb: Num. 35:25, ου καταφυγει ✕ εκει: G=absque notis ex. Cf. also Num. 14:7 where E read ΑΝΤΙΣΤΗΝΕΜΑΣ for our ΑΝΤΙΣΤΗΝΕΜΑΣ; with his usual conservatism Origen kept the Septuagintal ην κατεσκευασμεθα αντην but inserted after the relative ✕ παρελθοντες εν αυτη και: G (cf. S where the metobelus is placed in the wrong place)=absque notis ckx. Origen naturally followed his source (see below) in expressing Hebrew בָּה.

Contrast *ην παρηλθομεν (+ωστε) κατασκευασθαι αυτην* Ndps<sup>mtv</sup>mz<sup>m</sup> which rendering, while expressing the sense of MT more faithfully, avoids the pleonasm; in all likelihood it came from σ'.

The preceding examples are confined to passages where the addition is signalized by an asterisk which is extant. It may have been observed that the sign is derived from either G or S or from both, and that in all such instances the addition is found minus the sign in a number of cursives, in the Pentateuch principally in cx. Hence a number of additional examples becomes available where GS are not extant or, if extant, do not record the asterisk. Thus Lev. 16: 27, *א' הוֹבֵא אֶת דְּמָם, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*, BAK, *ων το αιμα αυτων εισενεχθη*, FMN, and the bulk of cursives, but *ων εισενεχθη το αιμα αυτων*, Gacx, exactly in the order of the Hebrew; Deut. 1: 36 *א' דָּרַךְ בֶּה, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*, εν (επ) αυτη is added in acx; 8, 9 Gacx add αυτης in company with AFM and the greater number of cursives; 31: 16 *א' הוֹרָא, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, וְעַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*, BAK, *εκει εις αυτην*, is found in acx along with AFMN and the bulk of cursives. Cf. also Gen. 35: 27, *εκει x*; Exod. 35: 24, *παρ αυτοις c* and others; Lev. 11: 32, *εν αυτω c* (in doublet v. 33); 27: 24, *παρ αυτου Nbekwx*; Num. 27: 17, *αυτοις x*. In Josh. shAΘbS add επ αυτου 5: 15; cf. also 5: 6 *αυτοις*, sufHAΘS. Occasionally the pleonasm is found in other (groups of) MSS: Gen. 6: 17 A; 24: 14 (20. 32); Exod. 21: 8 *ην (η f) καθωμολογησατο αυτην fi a<sup>1</sup>r, ην (η b<sub>2</sub><sup>1</sup>) ου καθωμολογησατο αυτην (αυτη ej) F\*dehjlps<sup>t</sup>vy-b<sub>2</sub>S = θ', contrast ην ου καθωμολογησατο M<sup>t</sup>; 32: 13, all exc Bhnrx; Lev. 6: 5 (5, 24) m (but αυτου perhaps a scribal error for αυτω); 13: 45 bw; 15: 6 FMdegi-lnopqs-vzb<sub>2</sub> (32); 12 d; 18: 5 F\*Mdgsjvza<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>; 23: 37 FMabeilo-wyz; Num. 35: 33 all except BGNruxa<sub>2</sub>; 34 Adhptx; Deut. 18: 22 dpt.*

(9) Bafhiqrx.

(10) ckS. The rendering was derived by Origen from θ' (see below, n. 19), but he saw fit to mark αυτη alone with the asterisk (and the sigla α' θ'). Peculiar as the proceeding was, it characterizes the MSS AFMb<sup>egj</sup>lowya<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub> that they merely excised the asterisked word but left otherwise the Origenic reading intact. The same reading underlies L only that the pleonasm was wiped out by the translator (see n. 22). Contrast *πας ω ευρεθη svz*. Not quite in the manner of Origen but nevertheless with the pleonasm expressed was the Septuagintal text rephrased by the recension underlying dnpt: *παντι ω ευρεθη παρ αυτω (s. αυτου s. αυτων)*. m, finally, is responsible for the paraphrase *ο ευρεθη παρ αυτοις* which, of course, is farthest from the Hebrew (see n. 20).

(11) b reads *πεπορευσθε*.

(12) A similar substitution is found Josh. 22: 9 in KRL = Lucian.

(13) Cf. e.g. *א' רִמְשֵׁי*, Gen. 7: 8. See Baumann, *Hebräische Relativsätze*, 1894, 31 f.; Gesenius-Kautzsch, Oxford, 1910, § 138 b; Wright-De Goeje, II, 322 D; Nöldeke, *Mand. Gramm.*, 448 f.

(14) Type *א' הוֹרָא דִּי*, Gen. 9: 3.

(15) Cf. Gen. 17:12, **לֹא מִזֵּרֶךְ הוּא**, **א' os ουκ εστιν εκ του σπερματος σου**, *which is not of thy seed*.

(16) So Deut. 20:15, **לֹא מִעֲרֵי הַגֵּרִים הָאֵלֶּה הֵנָּה**, **αι ουχι απο των πολων των εθνων τούτων** ✕ **εισιν** **1S<sup>Massi</sup>**=absque notis ckox (variants not bearing upon the point at issue are ignored; so in the sequel). Note the position of the copula at the end exactly where it is found in Hebrew (contrast Np<sup>b</sup>) and cf. Gen. 17:12, the transposition of the copula to the end of the clause in acmoxc<sub>2</sub>. Similarly when the translator chose to replace the relative clause by a participial construction, the participle of the substantive verb seemed to Origen to bring out the Hebrew pronoun (so Num. 35:31, **הוּא רֹשֶׁע**, **του ενοχου οντος**); hence he supplied it where it was missing (Gen. 7:2, **לֹא טָהֳרָה הוּא**, **των μη καθαρων οντων**, kS; the asterisk is wanting because some MSS of the *κοινη* probably had it; cf. EM. alii). Conversely, the participle of the substantive verb is obelized where there is nothing to correspond to it in the Hebrew (cf. Deut. 20:15, **τας μακρας**—**ουσας** **1S**; the obelized word is omitted in p<sup>b</sup>).

(17) Cf. the express mention of *a'* Exod. 3:5 (note 8).

(18) *σ'* is either expressly mentioned or included with *a' θ'* in the term *οι λ*, Exod. 35:23. 24, **παρ ω ευρεθη παρ αυτω**; Num. 4:9, **λειτουργησουσιν αυτη εν αυτοις**; 14:30, . . . **εν αυτη**. In the last two examples the '*ā'id* was expressed in *℣*. Num. 19:15, on the other hand, should be left out of count; the rendering of *σ'* **הִסְכֵּם לֹא כֶסֶף וְצִבְיָה לֹא חֲבִלָּה** is just as free as that of E.V.: *which hath no covering bound upon it* (contrast Saadya: **מִקֵּד מֵא לִיס עֲלֶיהָ צִמָּאָם מִקֵּד**; Luzzatto: *sul quale non vi sia un coperchio ben commesso*; Reuss: *auf welchem kein festgebundener Deckel ist*; free though these renderings be—**פְּתִיל** is a noun in apposition; the Samaritan reads **וּפְתִיל**; Dillmann: *auf welchem nicht eine Zubindung, eine Schnur, ist*; Gray: *which hath no covering and no cord upon it*—the Hebrew construction is not obliterated) for **אֵין צִמָּאָם פְּתִיל עֲלֶיהָ**. Contrast the examples from *σ'* cited in the following note.

(19) The '*ā'id* in the accusative: Exod. 21:8, **לֹא יַעֲדָהּ**, (*ketib*=) **א' ην ου καθωμολογησατο (=betrothed) αυτην**, hence F\*dhlops'vyb<sub>2</sub>Ⓜ(uid)S [*a'* took **א' as subject, os ου καθωμ. αυτην**]; contrast *σ' η μη καθωμολογημενη*. Lev. 18:5, **א' יֵשֶׁה אִתָּם**, **א' as ποιησει αυτας** [the antecedent apparently *κρισεις* **בְּשִׁפְטִים** *a' passim*], **θ' οσα ποιησει αυτα** [the antecedent presumably *κριματα*, cf. *℣*]. Deut. 4:19, **א' חֲלֹק . . . אִתָּם**, **α' a εμερισεν . . . αυτα θ' . . . αυτα**; contrast *σ' ατινα διεκοσμησεν*. 11:12 **א' דַּרְשׁ אִתָּהּ**, **α' θ' . . . εκζητει αυτην**. Josh. 21:9, **א' יָקִי� אִתָּהֶן בָּשֶׂם**, **α' θ' . . . εκαλεσαν αυτας εν ονοματι**. (In Deut. 32:17, **לֹא שִׁעְרוּם**, **α' ουκ ετριχιων αυτους**, *ους* need not have preceded; cf. 33:8, **א' נִסְיָחוּ . . . תִּיבְּבוּ**, **σ' ον επειρασας . . . εδοκιμασας αυτον**—this break in the construction follows classical models [Kühner-Gerth, § 561, 1]

and is frequently met with in E.V., cf. A.V. here and both versions Exod. 32:13.) Exod. 35:21, נִדְבָה רִוְחוֹ אֹתוֹ 'א, may be rendered *whom* ('ā'id in the accusative) *his spirit made willing* E.V., or *whose* ('ā'id in the genitive) *spirit made him willing*; א' seems to have followed the latter alternative, but his rendering of נִדְבָה אֹתוֹ is paraphrastic: ου αν (so with M<sup>m</sup>) εκουσιασματο πνα αυτου M<sup>m</sup>v<sup>m</sup> (cf. v. 22 s<sup>m</sup>), hence the pleonasm in this instance is not necessarily Hebraic, but may be Hellenistic. With analogous freedom א' rendered 25:2, יִדְבְּנוּ לָבוֹ, but only part of the phrase is preserved: הֵם וְיִצְחָק. The 'ā'id in dependence upon a preposition: Exod. 3:5 (see note 8); 35:23 (see note 10), א' ω ευρεθη συν αυτω θ' ω ευρεθη παρ αυτω (similarly σ', see note 18); 24 א' ω ευρεθη παρ αυτω θ' ος ευρεθη παρ αυτω (for σ' see *ibid.*); Num. 13:33 (32), א' עֲבַרְנוּ בָהּ . . . εν αυτη s<sup>m</sup> (uid) v<sup>m</sup> (uid) z<sup>m</sup> (uid) sine nomine, & αυτην (see note 12 and the example in the text); 19:15 (note 18), א' חֲסִים מִלִּפְנֵי חֲסִים (but θ' חֲסִים מִלִּפְנֵי חֲסִים (so read for חֲסִים מִלִּפְנֵי חֲסִים) 35:18, א' יְמִית, א' ב' . . . . . αποθανειται εν αυτω; Josh. 1:3 (note 8) θ' . . . . . επ αυτων; 24:17 בקריבם, א' יִלְחָקוּ & s<sup>m</sup>. The 'ā'id an adverb: Deut. 11:11, שָׁמָּה . . . א' א' ου (var. ην) . . . εκεισε θ' ην . . . εκει, contrast σ' ην . . . . . In Num. 33:54, θ' ον . . . the sequel is not extant; σ' οπου is probably preserved in its entirety.

(20) Gen. 35:15; 48:15; Exod. 6:26; 9:18 (οια for ητις τουαυτη); Lev. †4:23; 5:5; 15:4. †20; 18:3; Num. †5:3; 13:33 (32); 15:18. †39; 17:5 (20); †23:13; 34:13; Deut. †3:21; 4:5. 7; 6:1; †7:1; 9:28 (ης εξηγαγες αυτους, construction as in 11:11 η γη ην συ εισπορευη εκει m, only in the latter instance the 'ā'id is kept); 11:8. †12. †25; 12:†2. †29; 19:17; †28:21; 34:10. In the passages to which a † is prefixed m stands alone with its omission. Cf. also Exod. 8:22 (18) (και εφ η ο λαος μου εστιν εν αυτη εκει ουκ εσται κυνομνια; cf. εφ ης ο λαος μου επεστιν επ αυτης ουκ εσται εκει η κυνομνια a<sub>2</sub>); Lev. 6:30 (23) (και παντα τα περι της αμαρτιας εαν κτλ.; see note 44). Deut. 4:19 α is omitted through haplography (also in 1); 30:3 there is a homoioteleuton in m, but in all likelihood m omitted εκει. Cf. also Exod. 35:23 (note 10).

(21) To what extent the slavishness of & goes may be judged from renderings like אֲנִי . . . חֲסִים, Exod. 12:13, חֲסִים . . . חֲסִים, 25:28 (29), אֲנִי . . . חֲסִים, Num. 23:13, אֲנִי . . . חֲסִים, Josh. 9:4 (8, 31).

(22) Gen. 28:13; 31:13; Exod. 6:26; 9:18. 24; 21:13; Lev. 4:23; 7:15 (25); 11:33. 35; 14:35; 15:9; 18:3; 25:27. 31; Num. 3:3; 4:14; 5:7. 30; 11:21; 13:20 (19). 33 (32); 14:7. 24. 31; 15:18; 17:5 (20); 19:2. 15. 22; 23:13; 34:13; 35:17. 23. 25. 26. 34; Deut. 4:14. 19; 12:2; 19:17; 33:8; Josh. 2:10. 18; 8:24; 10:25. 27; 13:21; 22:19; 24:17. In some of these examples the codd. of & go apart: thus Lev. 4:23 the complement seems to be omitted in &<sub>2</sub>, but is expressed in &<sub>1</sub>; 11:33 omitted in &<sub>2</sub>, but

expressed in  $\mathfrak{L}^w$ ; 35 [on  $\mathfrak{L}^s$  see note 44] certainly omitted in  $\mathfrak{L}^w$ , but apparently also in  $\mathfrak{L}^r$  where *sibi* is an attempt at expressing *αὐτον*, cf. vs. 32; 15:9  $\mathfrak{L}^r$  has the pleonasm which is omitted in  $\mathfrak{L}^s$ ; 18:3  $\mathfrak{L}^w$  obliterates the complement which is expressed in  $\mathfrak{L}^r$ . In Deut. 11:29 and 32:50 the resumptive pronoun is replaced by a noun.

(23) *Par Palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium*, 1871, 417. 422. "In quo LXX dictionem hebraicam imitati sunt pronominum demonstrativorum usum in enuntiationibus relativis saepissime obvium ille saepissime imitatur [examples follow] . . . A quo more textum nostrum interdum recedere compluribus locis docemur [examples follow]."

(24) In Josh. the attitude of  $\mathfrak{L}$  to the '*ā'id* may be studied in 19 instances. In 5 cases (3:4; 4:3; 22:9; 24:13. 17 pr)  $\mathfrak{L}$  imitates the pleonasm; while in the last example the complement is omitted in <58> and in the last but two in A, in the other 3  $\mathfrak{L}$  is in agreement with all the witnesses. As regards the form of the complement, it is substantially the same in all witnesses in 4:3 and 24:17; but in 3:4; 22:9  $\mathfrak{L}$  affects a form nearer the Hebrew thus ranging itself in the former instance on the side of *ufih* <63. 85<sup>m</sup>. N. 56. 58> against *rzBA@* (. *rell*) and in the latter on the side of *KRUF* <30. 85<sup>m</sup>> against *Bh@bS* (. *rell*); 24:13  $\mathfrak{L}$  goes with *r* (see note 79a). We have probably to reckon in 3:4 with an intrusion into the archetype of a reading from *a'* or *θ'*. As for the 14 remaining cases,  $\mathfrak{L}$  stands alone with its omission in 6 cases (2:10. 18; 10:25. 27; 13:21; 24:17 *sec*), while in one instance (8:24) it has companions seemingly in *A@* <N. 29. 59. 82. 121; 15. 18. 64. 128; 144> the truth being that, Origen having inserted in the wrong place (in front of *απ αὐτης* thus including the latter sub *ast.*, comp. *S=b*) *καὶ ἐπεὶ πάντες ἐν στόματι ρομφαίας* which was missing in the texts, the complement disappeared together with the inserted clause in the texts mentioned. So we may really count 7 instances. There remain then 7 cases in which  $\mathfrak{L}$ 's omission is shared by Greek MSS. In 3 of these, the omission was original with  $\mathfrak{E}$ , as is evidenced by the *ast.* accompanying the complement in Origenic texts: 1:3 (✕ in *S*)  $\mathfrak{L} = \text{BshA@b}$  (. *rell*) against *rouf*; 9:4 (8, 31) (✕ in *S*)  $\mathfrak{L} = \text{BRA@}$  (. *rell*) against *Furhb* <63. 85<sup>m</sup>. 209; 15. 18. 64. 128; 58>, cf. *πάντες* | *χω[ρις]* *ἐπ αὐτον* (sic) *r* and *οι ὁ χωρις ἐπ αὐτους* <M<sup>m</sup>>; 14:9 (✕ in *GS*)  $\mathfrak{L} = \text{BrurhA@}$  (. *rell*) against *b* (. 58). In the 4 remaining examples  $\mathfrak{L}$  goes with all once (7:14); in 5:6 with *Bro b* (. 58. 63. 77. 237 and M. 29. 59. 131 *ex sil*) against *surhA@S* (. *rell*); in 5:15 with *Brouf* (. 63; 77; 30. 18. 128; 29. 71) against *shA@bS* (. *rell*); in 22:19 with *Kr* against *BurhA@bS* (. *rell*). In the last three examples  $\mathfrak{L}$  obviously coincides with *ro*, and in 22:19 *ro* are borne out by *Ks*, just as in 22:9 (see above)  $\mathfrak{L}$  agrees in form with *Kr*. On other points my investigation which is in process of completion will show the unmistakable affinity of  $\mathfrak{L}$  to the text of *Kr*. Hence it follows that out of a total of 14 examples the omission in one half is probably to be charged to the account of the Latin translator; while in the other half he is merely following the Greek archetype in which

the complement was either absent in agreement with the original of  $\mathfrak{E}$  or else obliterated from the original through a tendency to conform the diction to classical models. For of all the 7 examples of the second type there is only one (1:3) in which  $\mathfrak{L}$  goes against ro; it is legitimate to surmise that had we K before us it would range itself likewise against ro in this instance; at any rate the element was wanting in the still older archetype from which both  $\mathfrak{L}$ 's Greek text and Kro are descended.  $\mathfrak{L}$  apparently read in 1:3  $\epsilon\phi\sigma\nu$  with s. I may say in passing that the present paper was written primarily with a view to solving the question of what  $\mathfrak{L}$  read in Josh. 1:3; and it is thus shown that in order to get at the Greek underlying a daughter-version mere registration of the reading without a systematic study of its genesis will be of little value.

(25) Philo and Holy Scripture, 1895, xxvii.

(26) Cf. Gen. 28:13; 31:13; 48:15 (in 1 out of 2 quotations); Exod. 6:26; 21:13; Num. 19:15; Deut. 4:7.

(27) Gen. 34:14 (another paraphrase in dnp); Lev. 11:21 (*a* is omitted in B\*Ay through haplography—cf. also vs. 23 n); 25:30 ( $\tau\eta$   $\epsilon\chi\omicron\sigma\eta$   $\tau\epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\varsigma$ ; still freer  $\tau\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\chi\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\eta$  h). In a similar manner  $\mathfrak{E}$  condensed Gen. 7:22  $\text{בִּאֲפִי} \dots \text{אֵל} \text{ לִי} \text{ וְשָׂא} \text{ עִי} \text{ (s. } \epsilon\iota\chi\omicron\nu)$ ; m adds  $\epsilon\nu$   $\epsilon\alpha\nu\tau\omega$  (cf. the examples in the following note); but cc<sub>2</sub> $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{S} = \Omega$  add  $\epsilon\nu$   $\rho\omega\theta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$   $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ .

(28) Gen. 1:29.30; 41:38 (contrast Hip  $\epsilon\nu$   $\omega$   $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu \dots \epsilon\pi$   $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ ); Lev. 22:20 (so also 21:17 gn); Num. 19:2; 27:18 (cf. also Gen. 38:30,  $\text{עַל} \dots \text{אֵל} \text{ יָרֵךְ}$  E.V., *that had* . . . *upon his hand*,  $\epsilon\chi\omega\nu \dots \epsilon\pi\iota$   $\tau\eta\nu$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha$   $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu\iota\upsilon$  r).

(29) Similarly Exod. 35:21,  $\text{נָדְבָה רִיחֹו אֹתוֹ} \text{ אֵל} \text{ , } \sigma(\sigma\omicron)\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\delta\omicron\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\phi\upsilon\chi\eta$   $\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$ , 26  $\text{נָשָׂא לִבָּן אֶתְהָה} \text{ אֵל} \text{ , } \alpha\iota\varsigma$   $\epsilon\delta\omicron\epsilon\nu$   $\tau\eta$   $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  ( $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha$   $\epsilon\kappa\mu\mathfrak{S} = \Omega$ )  $\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu$  (+the compl.  $\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$  k). Cf. also Lev. 14:32,  $\text{אֵל} \text{ לֹא תִשִּׁיג יָרֵךְ} \text{ , } \tau\omicron\nu$   $\mu\eta$   $\epsilon\nu\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\tau\eta$   $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\iota$  ( $\mathfrak{S}$  adds the pronoun which is implied in the article; in the same manner  $\Omega$  added the pronoun in Exod. 25:2), *of him that findeth not means with his hand*.

(30) The original meaning of the phrase is disputed. See Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*<sup>3</sup>, 130; Baudissin, *Priestertum*, 183 f.; Nowack, *Archäologie*, II, 120 f.; Dillmann-Ryssel and Hoffmann on Lev. 7:37; *KAT*<sup>3</sup>, 647, n. 1.

(31) Cf. the margin in E.V.,  $\alpha' \theta'$  apparently gave the literal rendering throughout; cf. Field Exod. 28:37 (41); 29:29. In Lev. 16:32 h has the verb  $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\nu\nu$ ; a peculiar rendering is registered in M<sup>m</sup> ( $\epsilon\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\eta$   $\omicron$   $\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma$ ).

(32) See von Soden on Heb. 2:10 (*Hand-Commentar*, III, 2<sup>2</sup>, 28).

(33) c $\kappa\chi$ ; also F<sup>a</sup> <sup>m</sup>Malmuv<sup>m</sup>.

(34) gn. dpt and bw may represent  $\Lambda$  or  $\Omega$ .

(35) Kühner-Gerth, I, § 410, 6.

(36) Cf. vs. 11 (and without the preposition 7:15[25]). The complement is omitted in  $\mathfrak{L}$  ( $\tau\omega\nu$   $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\phi\epsilon\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$  is rendered *offerentibus*).  $\delta\omega\rho\omicron\nu$  dp\*(uid) assimilated in case to the participle; so in the similar construction Lev. 21:10,  $\text{אֵל} \text{ יִזְצֹק עַל רֹאשׁוֹ שֶׁן}$ , E.V., *upon whose head the* . . . *oil is*

*poured*, του επικεχυμενου (= ω επεχυθη s<sup>m</sup>, apparently from some other translation; it is incorporated in c, though no change of construction follows) επι την κεφαλην (the pronoun is added in Mb dgnptw = Λ(Ω)) του ελαιου (but το ελαιον, g).

(36a) A different conception underlies ον εφερεν η καρδια αυτου c; cf. S, vs. 29 (note 8), οis εφερεν η καρδια αυτων bnw; cf. *quibus quod* (a doublet?) *dabat cor eorum*, L.

(36b) See Liddell-Scott, s.v. φερω, VII, 3. b.

(36c) See note 8. Cf. ον . . . αυτων, x.

(36d) So E presumably wrote (= B<sup>ab</sup>FGMaefiklors<sup>t</sup>vxza<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>A<sup>W</sup>). δεσμον is inner accusative. ουχι was corrupted to ουκ εχι (εχει) in B\* followed by AN; cf. οσα εχει minus the negative c. δεσμω is a syntactical variant of δεσμον in hjlmquy; this reading is found also in bdptw Phil [see note 26] Eus, but minus the complement επ αυτω. On the other hand, Λ (gn) = ks<sup>m</sup> (uid) E uid S (uid) wrote οσα ουχι δεσμος καταδεεται επ αυτω (varr. αυτο, αυτων); see note 105. For επ αυτω we find also the var. επ αυτα.

(37) αυτω is added in 48:15 in (20).

(38) In 48:15 L simply *ante*, whereas m (note 20) Phil  $\frac{1}{2}$  (note 26) omit the complement entirely.

(38a) Cf. also Lev. 17:7, הם זנים אחריהם 'א, οis (bw prm εν, but bfw read εκπορευουσιν! ων gnX Thdt by anticipating the construction of the 'ā'id αυτοι εκπορευουσιν οπισω (om r\*) αυτων; Num. 15:39, אחם 'א אחריהם זנים, εν οis . . . οπισω αυτων (m omits the complement [note 20]); Num. 4:9, בהם . . . 'א, ο(σο)is (οσοι Almy error) . . . εν αυτοis (var. οσοis . . . αυτοis Fo; εν αυτοis om qu [cf. fir<sup>a</sup> (uid) which omit also the relative] by way of making room for the Hexaplaric αυτη; see also notes 59 and 105). 14, ο(σο)is (οσοι Abejly error) . . . εν αυτοis (see notes 59 and 105); 5:30, עליו . . . 'א, ω . . . επ αυτον (s. αυτω) (see note 105); 19:2, עליה . . . 'א, η . . . επ αυτην (varr. επ αυτη, επ αυτης, εν αυτη; the relat. om Ndfgl<sup>a</sup>np<sup>r</sup>t Cyr-codd in continuation of ηtis); Deut. 7:19, ביניהם . . . 'א, οis . . . απο προσωπου αυτων (οis] prm εις h: ως b<sub>2</sub>); 28:60, ην . . . απο προσωπου αυτων (but ων . . . απο π. αυτων, Θgn).

(39) εν τη γη αυτων is replaced by εν αυτοis in h; hence the doublet in c; Chr om εν τη γη αυτων entirely. Exactly so also Josh. 24:15. Similar constructions: Gen. 38:30, על ידו 'א, εφ ω ην . . . επι την χειρα αυτου (varr. εφ ων ην . . . επι τη χειρι αυτου, εφ ω ην . . . επι της χειρος αυτου, εφ ω ην . . . εν τη χειρι αυτου), as if = ידו על עליו 'א; Exod. 36:1, בהמה . . . נתן 'א, E.V., *in whom* . . . (hath) put, ω εδοθη . . . εν αυτοis, as if = להם 'א נתן להם בהמה . . . 2, בלבו . . . נתן 'א, E.V., *in whose heart* . . . had put, ω εδωκεν . . . εν τη καρδια (the art. implies the possessive which Ω added sub ast. from α'θ, S<sup>t</sup> = cm absque notis; f omits the complement entirely), as if = בלבו . . . נתן 'א; Lev. 11:33, אל תוכו . . . יפל 'א, lit. *into the midst of which* . . . falleth, εις ο (var. εν ω) εαν (εμ)πηση . . . ενδον, *into which*

falleth within; 16:32 (=Num. 3:3), יִמְלֵא אֶת יָדוֹ 'א, lit. *whose hand he shall fill*, *on an τελειώσουσιν τας χείρας αὐτου* (bw omit the pronoun, the article doing service therefor; του goes with the following infinitive); Lev. 21:17, בֹּר 'א (ω)τινι (ω Cyr ½) (ε)αν η εν (επ f) (ε)αυτω (varr. εν ω . . . εν αυτω M<sup>m</sup>, (ω)τινι . . . αυτω Ch; see also notes 28 and 44). 18, ω (ε)αν η εν (επ s) αυτω (var. εν ω . . . εν αυτω dgnpt, ω . . . αυτω c, ου . . . εν αυτω m; see also note 105). 19, ω εστιν εν αυτω (var. εν ω . . . εν αυτω dgnpt; see note 105). 21, ω εστιν εν αυτω (varr. ω . . . αυτω h, εν ω . . . εν αυτω gn; see note 105); 22:4, בְּמִנּוֹ . . . 'א, ω (var. ου m, ων f; see note 105) . . . εἰς (απ) αὐτου (the compl. om Cyr ⅔); 25:31, לָהֶם . . . 'א αἰς . . . εν αυταις (varr. αἰς . . . αυταις GMN ad-inps-vx-b<sub>2</sub>; see note 105); Deut. 12:29 (but the preposition is dropped in d; m, on the other hand, obliterates *εκει*; Gc<sub>jx</sub>, hence Ω, have the normal ου . . . *εκει*); 28:37 (the prep. is omitted in g); 30:3 (the prepos. is dropped in dp; in m there is an omission by homoioteleuton) שָׁמָּה . . . 'א, *whither*, εἰς οὓς . . . *εκει*, lit. *into which . . . there*.

(40) Cf. R.V., Ezek. 20:28. So ce here ην εξετεινα την χειρα μου δουναι αυτην (with the 'ā'id expressed). Here the Revisers retained the paraphrase of A.V.: *concerning which . . . to give it*.

(41) Varr. εφ ην, η; שֶׁלֹּם . . . לֵשֶׁם.

(41a) Similarly Num. 14:30; contrast Gen. 3:11. 17.

(42) But ac Cyr prm η(τις).

(43) ουτι o error.

(44) Cf. also *εαν* Lev. 6:30 (23) m; 21:17 u; *ωα* Exod. 5:2 dm; *ον τροπον* Lev. 16:32f.; *quemadmodum* Exod. 6:5 𐤀𐤕; Deut. 1:33 𐤀𐤕; *quomodo* Lev. 11:35 𐤀𐤕; *ut* Deut. 1:33 Luc; *sicut* 𐤀 Exod. 35:21. 21.

(45) Similarly Gen. 42:38, תִּלְכּוּ בָּהּ 'א η [by attraction for ην; but εν η Chr ½ cf. note 60; ου F<sup>b</sup> cf. note 78; *υι* dp error] (ε)αν πορευ(σ)ησθε (πορευεσθε); Lev. 15:11. 12, יָגַע בֹּר 'א, ου (οσων; οσον c<sub>gpx</sub> inferior reading) (ε)αν αψηγται (in vs. 12 d adds the complement αυτου). Cf. also 5:3, ης αν αψαμενος μανθη an amplified rendering of יִטְמֵא בָּהּ 'א.

(46) The pronoun is omitted in N𐤀 (note 22); l reads αὐτος. Other examples: Num. 13:33 (32), עֲבִירְנוּ בָּהּ 'א, ην παρηλθομεν αυτην (where the demonstrative does at the same time service as the obj. of κατασκεψασθαι, hence the transposition in Ggn; it is omitted in m [note 20]); 19:22, יָגַע בֹּר 'א, ου (ε)αν αψηγται αυτου (but the pronoun is omitted in dgopt 𐤀 [note 22] Cyr; ων . . . αυτων z<sup>m</sup>; cf. s<sup>m</sup> from *א' θ'*? the whole verse is missing in b<sup>mn</sup>); Josh. 3:4, תִּלְכּוּ בָּהּ 'א, ην πορευ(σ)εσθε (πεπορευεσθε L) αυτην BrzAΘL; 22:9 נֶאֱחָזוּ בָּהּ 'א, ην εκληρονομησαν αυτην, BhΘL.

(47) η om e; και περιβαλει εν αυτοις bw. Other instances: Gen. 21:23, בָּהּ גִּרְתָּהּ 'א, η (for ην, attraction; παρωκειν with the accusative, e.g. Gen. 17:8; Luke 24:18; εν η {32}) ου παρωκησας εν αυτη; 24:42, אֲנֹכִי 'א, הֲלֹךְ עֲלֶיהָ, ην νυν εγω πορευ(σ)ομαι επ (s. εἰς) αυτην (varr. εφ ην . . . επ αυτην h, εν η . . . εν αυτη bw, η . . . επ αυτην U<sub>4</sub> (uid) Δ<sub>2np</sub>, ης (sic) . . . επ



*αυτην* l; the complement is omitted in Chr); Lev. 4:23, **אָהַרֹן בֶּה**, *ην* (cognate accusative, see the examples in Liddell-Scott) *ἡμαρτεν εν αυτη* (*η . . . εν αυτη* fk; *η . . . . . m* [note 20]; the compl. is also om in **ל** [note 22]); Deut. 21:4, **לֹא יַעֲבֹד בּוֹ**, *ἡτις ουκ εἰργασται εν αυτη* (the complement is omitted in dpt; conversely in vs. 3 dpt have the complement which rell omit); 24:11, **אֵתְּהָא נִשְׁה בּוֹ**, *ου το δανιον (σου) εστιν εν* (s. επ) *αυτω* (*εαυτω* ejsvz for *εν αυτω* error); Josh. 24:17, **אֵתְּהָא עֲבַרְנוּ בּוֹ**, *η* (for *ην*, attraction) *επορευθημεν εν αυτη* (*εν η . . . εν* (om σ) *αυτη*, rufi; the complement is omitted in <58>); **אֵתְּהָא עֲבַרְנוּ בְּקִרְבָּם**, *ους παρελθομεν δι αυτων* (*εν οis . . . δι αυτων*, rufi; *οis . . . δι αυτων*, z; the complement is omitted in **ל** [note 22]).

(48) See above, § 3 (and n. 12).

(49) Lev. 16:32 (for f see note 44); 23:2.4 (I assume that **ⲉ** wrote *αυται αι εορται τω κυριω ΚΑΗΤΑΙ ΑΓΙΑΙ ΑΣ* καλεσετε αυτας. This reading which is found in FMNadefi-morsuvx-z **ⲉ**, Ath probably goes back to Ω; but here, as elsewhere, though starting from a different point, he succeeded in restoring the original. **ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΑΙ ΑΓΙΑΣ Β\*Α** is accordingly a corruption of **ΚΑΗΤΑΙ ΑΓΙΑΙ ΑΣ**. B<sup>ab</sup> a<sub>2</sub> b<sub>2</sub> **ⲉ** corrected *αγιας* into *αγαι as*, but suffered *και αυται* to remain. gnpt=Δ (so also bw) have the doublet (*και αυται κληται αγαι as*. It is true that *και αυται* mitigates the harshness of the double heading (see the commentaries and introductions); it is nevertheless in my judgment secondary); Num. 13:33 (32) (note 22; m reads *αυτοι*); 14:7 (note 8; with **ל** [note 22] goes b); 34:13 (notes 20 and 22); 35:25 (note 22); Deut. 4:19 (with **ל** [note 22] go B<sup>ab</sup> Ejksuvza<sub>2</sub> Ath Cyr Spec); 11:12 (note 20); 12:2 (notes 20 and 22); 18:14; 29:26 (25); 32:17. 17. 46; 33:8 (note 22); 34:10 (note 20); Josh. 2:10 (note 22); 10:25 (*ibid.*); 13:21 (with **ל** [note 22] go ruf).

(50) Gen. 5:29; 27:27; 45:4; Exod. 21:8, **יַעֲדָה** (*kere*=) **לֹא**, *ην* (*η* B error) (*ε*)*αυτω καθωμολογησατο*, BF<sup>a1</sup> nqux (but *ην καθωμ. αυτην* fi<sup>a1</sup>r; see note 8); 28:3; Lev. 18:5, **אֵתְּהָא יַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם וְחִי בָהֶם**, *α ποιησας ανθρωπος ζησεται εν αυτοis*, BANhr\**y* (but *α ποιησας αυτα ανος* κτλ. F\*Mdgsjvza<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>; on the other hand, the reading *ο ποιησας αυτα ανος* κτλ. F<sup>11a1</sup> a-ce(f)ik-mnw<sub>x</sub> **ל** Clem Luc is derived from Gal. 3:12; cf. Rom. 10:5, an inexact quotation); 23:37 (the pronoun is added in FMabeilo-wyz); Num. 23:8 (without **אֵתְּהָא**); Deut. 13:2(3); 18:21.22 (the pronoun is added in t; cf. also dp); 28:48 (but see note 8); 32:46; Josh. 7:14 (ruf have the passive construction). 14. 14.

(51) Gen. 1:11. 12 (for the exegetical conception see A.V.; in the latter ex. Theoph om the compl.); Exod. 5:2 (for dm see note 44); Lev. 6:30 (23) (*ω* qux error for *ων*; see also notes 20 and 44); Deut. 32:38 (where the translator misconceived the text).

(52) Lev. 16:27 (BAK; see note 8); Deut. 8:9 (see *ibid.*); 29:18 (17) (*ibid.*).

(53) Exod. 6:26 (the compl. omitted bfmnw  $\mathfrak{L}$  Phil; notes 20, 22, and 26); Lev. 25:27 (r.  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  with FMho or  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  with dep-vz cf. N; the other readings are faulty and derived from vs. 50; hence m  $\omicron\nu$  for  $\omega\iota$ ); Num. 5:7 (F reads  $\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\nu\iota=\omega\tau\iota\nu\iota$ ;  $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$   $a_2$  and  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$  defi<sup>a</sup>lmnqub<sub>2</sub> are inferior readings; the complement is omitted in bw  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]); Deut. 4:7 (for hlq Chr see note 105; c obliterates the relative;  $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  Abdptw; the complement is omitted in moy $a_2$  Phil Spec [notes 20 and 26]); 19:17 (the compl. omitted m Or-lat; notes 20 and 22).

(54) Lev. 14:35 ( $\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  a<sup>b</sup>).

(55) Exod. 32:13 Bhnrx $\mathfrak{L}$ r (the other texts add the 'ā'id); Lev. 11:23 ( $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ , paraphrased in n as  $\alpha\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$  (note 27);  $\omega\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  is the rdng of (16.73); hence the doublet  $\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  ej<sup>a</sup>; cf. also vs. 10 p<sup>b</sup> [note 105]); Num. 27:17 (x adds the 'ā'id); 36:3; Josh. 5:6 (surhAΘ $\mathfrak{S}$  add the 'ā'id).

(56) Gen. 24:14 (the 'ā'id added in (20.32)).

(57) Gen. 38:25 ( $\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  M<sup>a</sup>efgilmsty<sup>a</sup>' $a_2$  Phil Chr Cyr-ed,  $\epsilon\iota\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  p; the other texts read  $\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ); Lev. 6:5 (5:24) ( $\omicron\upsilon\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  k,  $\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma$  rel; for  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$  which follows= $\mathfrak{L}$ , m reads  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$ , probably an error); 27:24 ( $\omicron\nu$ ).

(58) Exod. 9:18 (but  $\omicron\alpha$  m (note 20);  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  c here and 11:6 inferior reading). 24 ( $\tau\omicron\iota\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  om d); 11:6. For  $\mathfrak{L}$  see note 22.

(59) Gen. 19:29; Exod. 4:17 ( $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$  n= $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ? inferior reading; the complement omitted in k $\mathfrak{S}$ ); 12:7; 25:28 (29) (but qu replace the second  $\epsilon\nu$  by  $\epsilon\pi$ ; d\* omits it entirely); 29:33 (x replaces the second  $\epsilon\nu$  by  $\epsilon\pi$ ); 38:12 (37:16); Lev. 13:52 (bw drop the first  $\epsilon\nu$ ; Fklm replace the second  $\epsilon\nu$  by  $\epsilon\pi$  and f reads  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$ ; the complement is omitted in Ay); Num. 5:3 (the second  $\epsilon\nu$  is replaced by  $\epsilon\pi$  in qu and omitted in Cyr  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; m omits the complement [note 20]); 11:21 ( $\mathfrak{L}$  omits the complement [note 22]); 35:17 (ditto). 23 (there is an omission in m; the first  $\epsilon\nu$  is omitted in Cyr-cod  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; k $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22] omit the complement); Deut. 17:1 (an omit the second  $\epsilon\nu$ ). Cf. also Exod. 6:4 fs (note 83); Lev. 11:32 deginpnstz  $\mathfrak{L}^{r_2}$ ; 18:3 bcdfginprtw; 21:17 M<sup>m</sup> (note 39). 18 dgnpt (*ibid.*). 19 ditto (*ibid.*). 21 gn (*ibid.*); Num. 4:9 dgnpt (note 38a). 12  $\mathfrak{L}$  (note 105). 14 FNdfginpt Cyr-cod (note 38a); 35:18 yb<sub>2</sub> (note 88). 34 bw; Deut. 28:52 buvm<sup>m</sup>wa<sub>2</sub>; Josh. 24:17 RUF ( $\epsilon\nu$  2<sup>o</sup> om o).

(60) Gen. 6:17 (but A adds  $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$  [note 8]); 7:15; 44:5 ( $\alpha\iota\iota\sigma\eta\tau\epsilon$  בר',  $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\nu\epsilon\iota$ ; for the construction cf.  $\epsilon\nu\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\iota\nu\omicron\varsigma\pi\omicron\tau\eta\rho\iota\upsilon\varsigma$ , Xen. *An.* 5.9.4; elsewhere with  $\epsilon\xi$  or  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ ; o  $\pi\iota\nu\epsilon\iota$  m, for which  $\pi\iota\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\kappa\eta\rho\eta\tau\eta\rho\alpha\varsigma\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\iota$  *drink bowls of wine*, Il. 8.232 is scarcely an analogy; the examples are from Liddell-Scott); Exod. 17:5 ( $\mathfrak{L}^v$  unde;  $\epsilon\nu$  om (77)); 34:10 (see note 8); Lev. 13:45 (bw add  $\epsilon\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ ). 57; 14:32 ( $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$  (84) for  $\epsilon\nu\omega$  error). 40 ( $\epsilon\nu$  is replaced by  $\epsilon\phi$  o); cf. also Gen. 42:38 Chr  $\frac{1}{2}$  (note 45).

(61) Deut. 28:52 (verb  $\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$ ; qb<sub>2</sub> replace the second  $\epsilon\pi$  by  $\epsilon\nu$ ; see also note 59); 32:37 (the same verb).

(62) Lev. 14:40 (o; note 60); but the example is not analogous.

(63) Lev. 13:54 BAFhkxya<sub>2</sub> (varr. εφ (αφ e error) ου . . . επ αυτω (αυτο f error) GMac-fh-lo-wzb<sub>2</sub>, ου . . . επ αυτω m, εφ ου . . . επ αυτον (so read for αυτων) qu, εφ ω (so b'; εφ ο bw) . . . εν αυτω bw, εν ω . . . επ αυτω g, εν ω . . . εν αυτα n, the archetype of gn probably read εν ω . . . εν αυτω, so 𐤀 where (cf. vs. 52) eo after in has dropped out; correct accordingly the statement in the Larger Cambridge Septuagint); Num. 35:34 (varr. εφ ης . . . επ αυτη fi, εφ ης . . . εν αυτη N; εφ ην . . . επ ου ην g, εφ ην . . . επ αυτης nv<sup>m</sup>; x𐤀 [note 22] omit the complement, but 𐤀 seems to have read εν η cf. bw [note 59]); Deut. 11:25 (q reads επ αυτους; m [note 20] omits the complement).

(64) Deut. 8:9 (b<sup>m</sup>[uid] adds εν αυτη). I ignore Num. 35:34 where, though the translator took אשר in the sense of אשר בה (his text read בתוכם / אשר אני שכן בתוכה / אשר אני שכן בתוכם) 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏, hence εφ ης εγω κατασκευη(σω) εν υμιν), nevertheless the 'ā'id was not in the Hebrew. Adhpt replace εν υμιν by επ αυτης (x has both) in agreement with 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 and with the complement expressed.

(65) Exod. 23:27 (verb εισπορευεσθαι; εις 1° om c [for the construction see note 76]; for εις 2° m<sup>m</sup>bsvzw read προς and <32> επ).

(66) Num. 35:33 (verb κατοικειν; so BGNruza<sub>2</sub>; all the other texts express the complement, the readings being εφ ην . . . επ αυτης ehkn\*svz εφ ης . . . εν αυτη c, εφ ης . . . επ αυτης rell); Deut. 31:16 (verb εισπορευεσθαι. B stands alone with its reading εις ην ουτος εισπορευεται which, it seems to me, goes back to הוּא בֹא שְׂמֵהּ בְּקִרְבִּי / הוּא בֹא בְּקִרְבָּה 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏. All the other texts are recensional. The smallest amount of diaskeue consisted in introducing the 'ā'id בקרבה, εις αυτην (ejmsuvza<sub>2</sub> Just); the other texts either introduce the missing שְׂמֵהּ (εκει h) or שְׂמֵהּ plus the 'ā'id (εκει εις αυτην AFMNaikoqrxyb<sub>2</sub>); the latter reading apparently goes back to Ω; on the other hand, Δ (Θdgnpt) added εκει (= שְׂמֵהּ) κληρονομησαι αυτην (in the place of εις αυτην which seemed superfluous) cf. l, εν αυτη (= 'ā'id) εκει (= שְׂמֵהּ) κληρονομησαι αυτην. The relative clause together with της γης (the antecedent) is missing in bfw T-A. To say with Kittel (*Biblia*) and others that 𐤀𐤁𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 om בקרבו . . . הָאָרֶץ is uncritical. bfw do not constitute a recension; bw should go with Θdgnpt, and f with i<sup>a</sup>r).

(67) Josh. 2:18 BRUF. Partially attested are the types εφ ου . . . επ αυτον (Num. 35:34 g; note 63); cf. εφ ου (Num. 33:55) but εφ ης GNcdghm-ptxb<sub>2</sub> cf. ο' ης v, apparently a recensional correction; the verb is κατοικειν; Deut. 1:36, the verb is επιβαινειν; q rds εφ ης; the complement is added (επ αυτη c, εν αυτη ax) in acx, presumably Ω; Josh. 1:3, 𐤀 wrote εφ ου (= BhsAΘL; see notes 8 and 24); 14:9 (see *ibid.*) and μεθ ου . . . μετ αυτον (Gen. 24:3, A T-A cf. μετ αυτοις n a cross between μετ αυτων and εν αυτοις). בו . . . 𐤀 is also rendered περι ου (Gen. 30:26); no example with the complement is available.

(68) Lev. 27:11 (where *mutum* 𐤀 = αφωνου = αφ ων ου). (Cf. also Num. 14:31 בה נאסחם 𐤀, αφ ης απεστητε απ αυτης, M<sup>m</sup>dgnpt [εφ s<sup>m</sup> z<sup>m</sup> error])

apparently from α' or θ'.) In the parallel passage, 7:15 (25) *ὡν προσάξει αὐτῶν καρπῶμα* B\*A\*bw the genitive stands by attraction to the antecedent in the place of the accusative and *καρπῶμα* is secondary accus.: *which one will offer as an offering*.

(69) Gen. 28:13 (varr. *ἐφ' ἡ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῆς* Memv, *ἐφ' ἡ . . . ἐπ' αὐτὴν* dp, *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτὴν* l Eus  $\frac{1}{2}$ , *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτῆς* bw; the complement is omitted  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22] Phil [note 26] Chr); Exod. 8:21 (17) (varr. *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτὴν* n, *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτῆς* bw, *δι' ἧς . . . ἐπ' αὐτῆς* a<sub>2</sub>; there is an omission in dp); 22 (18) pr (varr. *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτὴν* n, *ἐφ' ἡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτῆς* l, *ἐφ' ἡ . . . ἐν αὐτῇ* m). Cf. also Lev. 15:4 bdp<sub>rtw</sub> [note 80]. 24 r [*ibid.*]. 26 Mc-eijop-suvz [note 82].

(70) Num. 22:30.

(71) Lev. 15:4 sec (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* k, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* ab swz, *ἐφ' ὡν . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* e, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* g, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτοῦ* Fl, *ἐφ' ὦ . . .* without the complement m; the compl. is also omitted h). 9 (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* ej, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* b'r, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* gx; the complement om <84>  $\mathfrak{L}^s$  [note 22]). 17 (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* ejm, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* b'r, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* acgkl<sub>nsx</sub>). 20 (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* gjpr\*x, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* mr<sup>a</sup>, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτοῦ* c, *ἐφ' ρ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* i\*[uid]lz). 20 (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* eg\*j, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* rg<sup>a</sup>, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* lna<sub>2</sub>, *ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* x, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . m* without the complement [note 20]). 26 (varr. *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* ejx, *ἐφ' ὦ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* kmr, *ἐφ' ο . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* l, the compl. om c); 16, 9 (var. *ἐφ' οὐ . . . ἐπ' αὐτῷ* l Cyr-ed  $\frac{1}{2}$ ; *ἐπ' αὐτῶν* w error). 10 (the compl. om N). Cf. Gen. 24:42 h (note 47); 28:13 l Eus  $\frac{1}{2}$  (note 69).

(72) Lev. 11:32 (עֲלֵיו מֵהֶם בְּיָמָם כֹּל אֵץ wrote παν ἐφ' ο *ἀν ἐπιπτεση ἀπ' αὐτῶν τεθνηκότων αὐτῶν* Bdp and with corruptions AF<sup>a</sup>mbghntwy (Lagarde apparently did not follow his MSS [bw]). a<sub>2</sub> goes likewise with these texts except that it replaces *ἐφ' ο* by *οὐ*. The other witnesses, if we discount corruptions, are divided between the readings *ἐπι τεθνηκότων αὐτῶν* F\*Mceijms<sup>t</sup>z<sup>t</sup> and *ἐπι τι τεθνηκότων αὐτῶν* F<sup>a</sup>Gkloqrs<sup>m</sup>uxz<sup>mb</sup><sub>2</sub>. ax go apart with inferior readings. A real complement, unless *ἐπι τι* be such, is found only Cyr-ed *ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ*); 15:6 (but *ἐφ' ὦ* ab'ejm rsz (and *οὐ* <32>)). The complement (*ἐπ' αὐτῷ*, *ἐπ' αὐτῷ*, *ἐπ' αὐτοῦ*) is found FMdeijklmnopqs-vzb<sub>2</sub> <32> Cyr-cod; Josh. 9:4 (8, 31) (but *ἐφ' ὡν* R. Ω added the complement sub ast.; see notes 8 and 24). Further examples of classical types: . . . אֵץ אֲלֵי, ω Gen. 24:14 (but <20. 32> add *αὐτῇ*); (בִּידוֹ) אֵתוֹ . . . אֵץ παρ' ω (Gen. 44:9. 10. 16. 17; Exod. 35:23 (see notes 9 and 10). 24 כֹּל אֵץ נִמְצָא אֵתוֹ, παρ' οὐς εὐρεθῇ, BAFabfhi<sup>a</sup>oqrwxy. The complement παρ' αὐτοῖς is add Mdegi\*jlnpstvza<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub>. παντι οσοις εὐρεθῇ παρ' αὐτοῖς km (cf. ο' παντι οσοις εὐρεθῇ, s<sup>m</sup> v<sup>m</sup> z<sup>m</sup>), πας ως εὐρεθῇ παρ' αὐτοῖς c, אֵתוֹ אֲלֵי . . . ? אֵתוֹ אֲלֵי. km have probably preserved Ω's reading. θ' wrote πας ος εὐρεθῇ παρ' αὐτῷ v<sup>m</sup> with which cf. c); בִּימָתוֹ . . . אֵץ, παρ' οὐ Lev. 27:24 (παρ' αὐτοῦ add Nbeckwx, apparently = Ω).

(73) Exod. 34:12 (varr. *εις ην . . . επ αυτην* km, *εις ην . . . εν αυτη* dp<sub>rt</sub>; the compl. om Spec); Deut. 1:22 (varr. *εις ας . . . εν αυταις* kb<sub>2</sub>, *εις ας . . . εν αυτη* s, *εις ας . . . εν αυτας* η, *εις ας . . . εις αυτους* bg w cf. *in eos*  $\mathfrak{L}$  in the preceding example, *ας . . . εις αυτας* acdmp). Cf. also *εν ω . . . εν αυτω*, Gen. 24:42 bw (note 47).

(74) Gen. 13:3.14; 19:27 (the complement *εκει* is add Eh); 21:17; 35:27 (but m has *ην*; for the construction see note 47; xy add the complement); Exod. 9:26; 18:5; 20:21 (the complement added AM<sup>u</sup>dknpt, hence in  $\Omega$  [but not  $\mathfrak{S}$ ] and  $\Lambda$ ); Num. 35:25 (see note 8); Deut. 18:6 (the complement is add acdoptx).

(75) Gen. 20:13; 31:13 (*ου* [so all except An which read  $\omega$ ; the government of the preposition is made to extend from the antecedent to the relat.] . . . *εκει . . . και* [the two relatt. clauses are thus contracted] . . . *εκει*; the first *εκει* is om r Phil [note 26] Chr  $\frac{1}{2}$  Cyp, the second bdefinopwd<sub>2</sub> Phil [note 26] Chr Thdt Cyp); 33:19; 40:3 (Ef om the complement; f reads *εν ω* for *ου*); Exod. 21:13 (the compl. om Ay $\mathfrak{L}$  (note 22) Phil (note 26); Deut. 30:1; Josh. 22:19 (the complement om Kr $\mathfrak{L}$ ; see note 24).

(76) Gen. 10:14 (*ουτοι* c for *οθεν* error; the compl. om n Theoph); 24:5 (the compl om n Chr  $\frac{1}{2}$ ); Deut. 9:28 (m om the complement; in the place of *οθεν* it has *ης* in the sense of *εξ ης*, the preposition being implied in the preverb); 11:10; Josh. 20:6 in a supplemented passage (Ahruf b $\mathfrak{S}$ ). Cf. also Exod. 30:36 where  $\mathfrak{H}^m$  reads  $\overline{\text{הבשר}}$ .

(77) Josh. 4:3.

(78) Lev. 6:28 (21) B<sup>\*uid</sup>Ay ( $\omega$  . . . *εν αυτω* Cyr-cod  $\frac{1}{2}$ , *ου . . . εν αυτω* rel, *in quo . . . in eo*  $\mathfrak{L}$ ); Deut. 11:24 (BAa<sub>2</sub> [uid]).  $\Omega$  wrote *ου . . . εν αυτω* G (with the complement sub ast.) cox. The other texts have probably preserved the original *ου*, as is evidenced by the accus. of the antecedent (assimilation). The verb is *παρειν*; the example belongs therefore to note 45).

(79) Exod. 12:30 (but *η . . . εν αυτη* m, *εν η . . . εκει* egj).

(79a) Josh. 24:13 *εφ ην . . . επ αυτης* (varr. *εφ ης . . . επ αυτης*; *εφ ην . . . επ αυτην*; *ην* [by attraction to the accus. preceding] . . . *εν αυτη* R $\mathfrak{L}$ ).

(80) Lev. 15:4 pr B<sup>\*N</sup>fya (varr. *εφ η . . . επ αυτη* Ai, *εφ ην . . . επ αυτην* c<sup>b</sup>x, *εφ ης . . . επ αυτης* bdprtw Cyr, *εφ η επ αυτης* c\*, *εφ ην . . . sine complemento* Mh, *εφ ην . . . επ αυτης* B<sup>ab</sup> F rel). 24 BAafix (varr. *εφ ης . . . επ αυτης* r, *εφ ην . . . επ αυτην* eiioqsuvxzb<sub>2</sub>, *εφ η . . . μετ αυτης* dm by exeget. error, *εφ ην . . . επ αυτης* FMN rel). Cf. also Gen. 28:13 Memv (note 69); Lev. 15:20 pr c [note 71]. 26 agn [note 82]. Cf. *εφ ου . . . επ αυτον* Gen. 28:13 dp (note 69).

(81) Josh. 5:15 (but *εφ ου* ufz <82>; the complement *επ αυτου* probably belongs to  $\Omega$ ; see note 8). Cf. Exod. 3:5 s Acta (but *εν ω* in the other witnesses;  $\Omega$  added the complement sub ast. from a', see note 8).

(82) Lev. 15:26 pr BAFGMNBklmwxa<sub>2</sub>b<sub>2</sub> (varr. *εφ ης . . . επ αυτης* Mc-eij op-suvz, *εφ ω . . . επ αυτω* <32>, *εφ η . . . επ αυτης* agn, *εφ ο . . . επ*

αυτη b', εφ ης . . . μετ αυτης f by wrong exegesis). Cf. also Gen. 28:13 bw (note 69); Lev. 15:4 pr B<sup>ab</sup> F rell (note 80). 4 sec FI [note 71].

(83) Exod. 6:4 (varr. εν η . . . εν αυτη fs, εν η . . . επ αυτη <107>, b<sub>2</sub> om εν η, n condenses by omitting εν η . . . επ αυτη). See note 84.

(84) Lev. 18:3 B\*y (varr. εν η . . . εν αυτη bcdfginprtw  $\mathfrak{L}^r$  Phil-codd Clem Thdt Luc [note 59] εν η . . . επ αυτης B<sup>ab</sup>AFMNaejhlosuvxzb<sub>2</sub> Phil-ed Eus, εν η . . . εν αυτοις [see note 39] ck, the compl. om m $\mathfrak{L}^w$  [notes 20 and 22], a<sub>2</sub> condenses by omitting εν η . . . επιτηδευματα). Cf. also Exod. 25:28 (29) qu (note 59); 29:33 x (*ibid.*); Lev. 13:54 gn, cf. f (note 63); Num. 5:3 qu (note 59); 35:18 a<sub>2</sub> (note 88). Cf. also εν ω . . . επ αυτον Gen. 41:38 Hip (note 28).

(85) Num. 13:20 (19) sec (varr. εις ας . . . επ αυταις gikn, ας . . . εν αυταις boquwb<sub>2</sub> [see note 47], the compl. om  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]). Cf. also Num. 4:12 F (note 105).

(86) Num. 13:20 (19) pr (but εις ην . . . επ αυτην Ay).

(87) Num. 5:8; Deut. 1:22 (but δι ης . . . επ αυτης a<sub>2</sub>). Cf. Josh. 2:18 hAΘL <.58> (see note 67; also notes 22 and 24).

(88) Num. 35:18 BA<sup>c</sup>mGNc-fkptux (and also a<sub>2</sub> where επ is apparently an error for εν; var. εν ω . . . εν αυτω yb<sub>2</sub>, the compl. omitted A\*FM rell).

(89) Deut. 1:33 (varr. καθ ην . . . εν αυτη AFMNacghk-orxyb<sub>2</sub>, ην . . . επ [so read for απ] αυτης a<sub>2</sub>).

(90) Gen. 24:3 (but see note 67; the compl. is om S\*).

(91) Lev. 11:34 (varr. εις ο . . . επ αυτω cdehjpt, εις ο . . . επ αυτου am and so also probably l $\mathfrak{L}^w$  where απ is error for επ, εφ ο . . . επ αυτο x  $\mathfrak{L}^r$ , ο . . . επ αυτο  $\mathfrak{L}^s$ ?; εις ο . . . εις ψιτον g [*sic*]).

(92) Lev. 5:5 (but in eo  $\mathfrak{L}^r$ ).

(93) Gen. 35:15 (the compl. is om in efm [note 20] qu Chr Cyr-ed); 39:20 (but ου . . . εκει fi $\mathfrak{S}$ ;  $\mathfrak{H}^s$  om וְיִרְדּוּ); Exod. 12:13; Deut. 12:2. Cf. Exod. 12:30 egj (note 79). Cf. also classical εν ω Gen. 40:3 f (note 75).

(94) Josh. 10:27 (but ου . . . εκει r $\mathfrak{S}$ ).

(95) Lev. 18:3 (ην om c error; the compl. om Thdt); Num. 14:24 (but ην . . . εκει mr\*, the verb is εισελθειν; the compl. om  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]); 15:18 (but ην . . . εκει bdh, ην . . . sine complemento m [note 20]  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]; ης e for εις ην error); 33:54 (but οις . . . εκει lm; וְשָׁרָא is here preceded by וְאֵל); 35:26 (the compl. om  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]); Deut. 4:5 (varr. ην . . . εκει Fedi\*klb, η [attraction] . . . εκει x, ην [or, by attraction, η] . . . sine complemento gm [note 20] n). 14 (the complement om <128>  $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]; m has ην κατοικειτε for εις ην . . . εκει). 27 (but εν οις . . . εκει l); 6:1 (the compl. om dm [note 20]); 7:1 (but ην . . . εκει cs, η [the preverb is om] . . . sine compl. m [note 20]); 11:8 (ην . . . εκει hq, see below on 29; the compl. om bmw). 10 (the compl. om u). 11 (but ην . . . εκει ma<sub>2</sub>, the compl. [but also κληρονομησαι αυτην] om d $\mathfrak{L}$  [note 22]). 29 (but ην . . . εκει ANΘcegm; the construction is ην . . . αυτην); 12:29 (α . . . εκει d, ου . . . εκει G c jx=apparently Ω, the compl. om m [note 20]; εις ους om k by error); 23:29 (21) (but ην . . . εκει b<sub>2</sub>

Cyr); 28:21 (the compl. om m [note 20]). 37 (but *ous* . . . *εκει* q). 63 (but *ης* [by attraction for *ην*] . . . *εκει* cdpt, the compl. om h); 30:3 (but *ous* . . . *εκει* dp; for m see note 20). 16; 32:50 (e has a faulty reading; for *ℒ* see note 22).

(96) Deut. 3:21 (but *εφ* *αὐς* . . . *εκει* hqy<sup>a?</sup>, *εν* *αὐς* . . . *εκει* l, the compl. om m [note 20]).

(97) Num. 17:4 (19) (*εκειθεν* ah). Cf. also Exod. 29:42 (*εκει* FMst<sup>†</sup> rell Or-gr *ℒ* against *εκειθεν* BAafhior<sup>m</sup>); 30:6 (*εκει* AFMbcegj-mqsuvwy-b<sub>2</sub> *ℒ* against *εκειθεν* B rell; Deut. 3:21.l; 4:27 l).

(98) Num. 23:13 (the compl. om *ℒ* [note 22]).

(99) Gen. 3:23 (by identification with מִמְּנָה . . . 'א; the relat. cl. is om in L).

(100) Josh. 8:24 (certainly F RUF n which read *επ* *αυτης*; *απ* *αυτης* Bh is possible, despite Masius, *ου* . . . *απ* *αυτης* = *αφ* *ης*, down which, sc. *απο της καταβασεως*, *℔*<sup>s</sup> read מִדְּבָר for *επ* *αυτης*; see note 24).

(101) Exod. 8:22 (18) sec Bfh<sup>il</sup>pr<sup>s</sup> (varr. *εφ* *η* . . . *εκει* AM rell, *εφ* *ης* . . . sine complemento d Or-gr, ma<sub>2</sub> om *εφ* *ης*, m has *και* in front of *εφ* *ης* primo).

(102) Lev. 15:23 (varr. *ου* . . . *επ* *αυτου* g, *ου* . . . *επ* *αυτο* abfknz, *εφ* *ου* . . . *επ* *αυτω* <32> *ℒ*, *εφ* *ο* . . . *επ* *αυτω* <18>, *ου* . . . *εν* *αυτω* x).

(103) Lev. 15:22 BANac<sub>2</sub> (*εφ* *ου* . . . *επ* *αυτο* Fk, *εφ* *ου* . . . *επ* *αυτω* l, *εφ* *ω* . . . *επ* *αυτω* ej, *εφ* *ω* . . . *επ* *αυτο* mr, *εφ* *ο* . . . *επ* *αυτου* i, *εφ* *ο* . . . *επ* *αυτω* fx, *εφ* *ο* . . . *επ* *αυτο* M rell). Cf. also Exod. 8:22 (18) pr m (note 69); Lev. 15:23 abfknz (note 102).

(104) *δι* *ου* . . . *εν* *αυτω*, *εξ* *ου* . . . *εν* *αυτω*, *μεθ* *ου* . . . *εν* *αυτω*.

(105) Other examples, לֹךְ 'א, *οσα* *εστιν* (*εν*) *αυτοις*, Lev. 11:9.10 (but *οις* . . . *αυτοις* pb). 12; Deut. 14:9.10; *א' יעשה מלאכה בהם*, *ο* (*ε*) *αν ποιηθη εργον εν αυτω* (*εις* *αυτο* x, *επ* *αυτω* F) Lev. 11:32 BAGacfhlm<sup>p</sup>qua<sub>2</sub> (varr. *εν* *ω* . . . *εν* *αυτω* deginst z<sup>ℒ</sup><sup>rz</sup>, *ω* [*ων* w] . . . *εν* *αυτω* FMbikorwxb Cyr-cod, *εφ* *ο* . . . *εν* *αυτω* y, *ω* . . . sine compl. b', *ℒ*<sup>w</sup> likewise om the compl.). 35 *עליו* . . . *א' יפל* *ο* (*ε*) *αν* (*εμ*-, *επι*) *πηση* . . . *επ* *αυτο* (*αυτω* egjlm; *αυτον* o error) (but *εφ* *ο* [*ω* fir] . . . *επ* *αυτο* PbGbd fhiKrFw *ℒ*; the compl. om *ℒ*<sup>w</sup> [note 22; see also n. 44]); *א' ישרתו בהם*, *οσα* *λειτουργ(η)ουσιν εν αυτοις* Num. 4:12 (F has *εις* a for *οσα*; *ℒ* in *quibus* . . . in *illis* [note 59]; cf. also vs. 14 <16. 77> [note 38a] and 26 where *℔*<sup>m</sup> rds. *א' יעשה להם*); *א' מנחתם בה* *נן* *υμεις απεστητε απ αυτης* Num. 14:31 (varr. *αφ* *ης* . . . *απ* *αυτης* M<sup>mdgnpt</sup> Tract, *ης* . . . *απ* *αυτης* bw, *de qua* . . . sine compl. *ℒ*). Deut. 28:49 *לשנו* . . . *א' ο* . . . *αυτου* (but *ου* . . . *αυτου* AFG<sup>o</sup>adefi<sup>b</sup> jprswx zb<sub>2</sub> *ℒ*). Elsewhere the construction is confined to u (Lev. 21:18 with h. 19; 22:4; Num. 5:30 [note 38a] with q; qu figure among the witnesses in Lev. 11:35, hqu among those in Lev. 11:32; Num. 14:31), c (Lev. 15:18 [note 42]; c also Lev. 11:32. 35; Num. 14:31), A (cf. N) (Lev. 21:21), A (Lev. 25:3; but the antecedent is in the dative), bw *ℒ* (Num. 4:9; note 38a), gn along with ks<sup>m</sup> *ℒ* (Num. 19:15, *אין צמיד פתיל עליו*, *οσα* *οχα*).

δεσμος καταδεδεται επ αυτω (αυτο); *supra quod* ℒ=οσα . . . επ αυτο); hlq (Deut. 4:7).

(106) Psichari, *l. c.*, 182.

(107) In favor of the theory that we are dealing with a Hebraism the circumstance might be adduced that where the Hebrew has no 'ā'id the translators refrain from introducing one of their own making. This is my general impression. Still instances are known to me where a complement is introduced at least in certain witnesses of the text. Cf. Gen. 28:20 אֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ, ἡ ἐγὼ πορευομαι + εν αυτη D Megijnr.

(108) The following instances remain to be disposed of:

Gen. 2:11, שֵׁם הַזֶּהב, 'ℒ, *εκει ουν* (so Edefjl-prtyd<sub>2</sub> Phil-codd Theoph: γουν g: om h'i℄ (uid) p Phil-codd: ου AMabh\*vwxA~~ℒ~~ error?) το χρυσιον.

2:19, וְכָל א' יִקְרָא לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה הוּא שְׂמוֹ. The witnesses vary between *και παν ο* (ℓ<sub>1</sub>av) *εκαλεσεν αυτο* and . . . αυτα. The omission of the pronoun in some witnesses, notably in m (note 20) and Philo (note 26), might be taken as an indication that *αυτο* was the original and that the 'ā'id was omitted as redundant. Phil-arm  $\frac{1}{2}$ , however, together with certain Greek MSS and ~~ℒ~~CE, has αυτα, and I am inclined to believe that such was the original reading. αυτα is uniformly attested for לוֹ in מִיָּה יִקְרָא לוֹ. Hence the pronoun in לוֹ is not a mere 'ā'id but refers back to the generic word for "animal," exactly as in the first לוֹ.

30:35, כָּל א' לָבָן בּוֹ, *και παν ο ην λευκον εν αυτοις* (sc. τοις τραγοις και ταις αιξις; hence in agreement with the nearer noun, *εν αυτοις* kx) = *and whatever was white among them*. The omission of *εν αυταις* in Ldp ~~ℒ~~ connects the clause with what follows: *και παν ο ην λευκον και παν ο ην φαιον εν τοις αρνασιν* (hence the transposition in bw). Note, however, the varr. *επ αυτοις* Chr and *εν αυτω* s.

49:28, אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כִּבְרַנְתּוֹ, *εκαστον κατα ευλογιαν αυτου*. ℄ read אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כִּבְרַנְתּוֹ. vz~~ℒ~~ Chr imply אִישׁ כִּבְרַנְתּוֹ.

Exod. 6:5, אֵת נַאֲקַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל א' מִצְרַיִם מַעֲבִידִים אֹתָם, *the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage*, hence the antecedent of א' is בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. So (76) . . . ος οι Αιγυπτιοι καταδουλουνται εαντοις; also *ων* qua<sub>2</sub> (by attraction to *ων*; cf. *ου* l) . . . αυτους. But whether we read *a* with bwz<sup>m</sup> or *ον* with BAFM rell, the translator took נַאֲקַת to be the antecedent, the text meaning: *the groaning . . . , wherewith the Egyptians keep them in bondage*, ℒ removes the harshness and comes nearest the intent of the Hebrew by rendering freely: *the groaning . . . , how the Egyptians keep them in bondage*.

Lev. 6:27 (20), כָּל אִשׁ יִגַע בְּבִשְׂרָהּ יִקְדֹּשׁ וְאֲשֶׁר יִזְהַ מִּדְּמָה, *ελ ο αποτομενος των κρεων αυτης αγιασθησεται και ω εαν επιραντισθη απο του αιματος αυτης επι το ιματιον, ος εαν ραντισθη επ αυτο, πληθησεται*. The translator interpreted כָּל as אִישׁ.



(rather than as **כל דבר**), so also above vs. 18 (11). Accordingly he continued **ואשר = והאיש אשר** (= **וכל איש אשר**), to which the 'ā'id would have to be supplied in the form **עליו**; the next **אשר** he took again as **האיש אשר**; he imitated the Hebrew construction which really should have had the 'ā'id expressed, **אשר יזה עליו** is *os εαν παντισθη*; **על הבגד = עליה**. The variants admit of explanation. *πας* (pt) in front of *ω εαν επιπαντισθη* brings out the **כל (כל איש אשר)**; *os f* is adjusted to the next clause; *εν ω* Cyr-ed  $\frac{1}{3}$  more literal than *ω* for **עליו** (see above); *o choqu*, means *what part* sc. of the blood; *os* is the reading of B<sub>Aya</sub><sub>2</sub> Cyr-ed  $\frac{1}{3}$ , the majority of the witnesses have *o*, taking *επ αυτο* as the 'ā'id and *ματιον* as the antecedent; cf. *ℒ supra tunicam, quaecumque aspersa fuerit; ubicumque ℒ* for *ω εαν* implies *ου εαν*?

22:5 **א' יטמא לו** primo, *o* (varr. *ω, ου, η*; om Cyr  $\frac{1}{2}$ ) *μανει αυτον*, secundo, *εν ω μανει αυτον*. Activum pro passivo. The second is eased by the prefixion of *η (ει)* gn and *παν h*.

Num. 12:12, **אשר בצאתו ונ'**, translated with great freedom.